

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the final Office Action of March 3, 2006 is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the Examiner is requested to note that the specification has now been amended so as to update the information concerning the reference to the parent application, as required by the Examiner.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 15-18 are allowed, but rejected remaining claims 19-28 in view of the prior art. In particular, the Examiner rejected claims 19-28 as being unpatentable over the Andou reference or the Chen'335 reference or the Hayashi reference in view of the Chen'363 reference. However, independent claim 19 has now been amended as indicated above. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 19 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner suggested that independent claim 19 would be allowable if the structure of the convexities was further defined. Consequently, independent claim 19 has now been amended to recite that the exposed rough surface of the wiring layer has a plurality of convexities *formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating*. As explained in paragraphs [0088] and [0109] of the specification, convexities formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating have very distinct shapes (See Fig. 5d), and these distinct shapes allow the wiring layer to tightly adhere to another surface (during, for example, manufacture of a multi-layer wiring board). It is submitted that the Andou reference, the Chen'335 reference, the Hayashi reference, and the Chen'363 do not, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggests a wiring layer having an exposed rough surface with a plurality of convexities *formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating*. Therefore, it is submitted that amended independent claim 19 is clearly distinguishable from the prior art of record.

In addition to the distinctions discussed above, it is submitted that the prior art of record also does not disclose or even suggest a wiring board in which a surface shape of an exposed rough surface of the electrically insulating substrate is *substantially the same* as a surface shape

of the exposed rough surface of the wiring layer, as explained in the remarks submitted on June 5, 2006 and explained to the Examiner during the telephone conversation of June 19, 2006. Moreover, in view of the amendment to independent claim 19 as discussed above, it is submitted that the exposed rough surface of the electrically insulating substrate also now has a shape of convexities that are formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating. This distinct shape will also allow the electrically insulating substrate to tightly adhere to another surface. It is submitted that the prior art of record clearly does not teach or even suggest that a surface shape of an exposed rough surface of an electrically insulating substrate is *substantially the same* as a surface shape of an exposed rough surface of a wiring layer, wherein the exposed rough surface of the wiring layer has a plurality of convexities formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating (with the corresponding distinct shape).

As discussed above, the Andou reference, the Chen '335 reference, the Hayashi reference, and the Chen'363 reference do not, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an exposed rough surface of a wiring layer having a plurality of convexities formed of particles deposited by electrolytic plating, *or* a surface shape of an exposed rough surface of an electrically insulating substrate that is substantially the same as a surface shape of an exposed rough surface of a wiring layer. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify or combine the references so as to obtain the invention recited in amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 19 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki HIGASHITANI

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm

Registration No. 44,142

Attorney for Applicants

WDH/tnt
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 30, 2006